

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

DIVERSITY PIPELINE TASK FORCE COURTS WORKING GROUP FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FEBRUARY 15, 2007

© 2007 The State Bar of California. All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any medium, without prior written permission.

**DIVERSITY PIPELINE TASK FORCE
COURTS WORKING GROUP
FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FEBRUARY 15, 2007**

BACKGROUND

In September 2005, the State Bar created the Diversity Pipeline Task Force, a broad-based group of stakeholders committed to furthering the State Bar's diversity goals.

The Task Force is comprised of representatives from the bench and bar, law firms, corporate counsel, educational institutions and the government/public sector. The pipeline model is intended to serve as a resource model and guide to fostering collaborative activities and efforts along the career pipeline, pre-school to law school, resulting in entry and advancement into the legal profession. Its main goal is to develop student aspirations and to generate and provide support to increase the number of diverse lawyers in the legal profession.

The work of the Task Force was performed by various work groups, with the Courts Working Group being one such entity. The Honorable Brenda Harbin-Forte, a judge of the Alameda County Superior Court, chaired the Courts Working Group. A complete roster of the Courts Working Group is appended hereto as Attachment 1.

As part of its Task Force activity, the Courts Working Group held a Judicial Summit in conjunction with the State Bar Diversity Summit in June 2006. The summit, themed "Continuing a Legacy of Excellence: A Summit On Diversity In The Judiciary", was called for the purpose of convening judges and other key participants, including representatives from the Governor's Office, Legislature, Judicial Council and bar leaders, to discuss the current state of diversity in the judiciary and to develop recommendations to encourage a more diverse bench. A copy of the agenda for the Judicial Summit is appended hereto as Attachment 2.

After considering the comments from the members of the judiciary and other participants at the Judicial Summit, and based on legislative events that occurred thereafter, the Courts Working Group has developed the following recommendations.¹

¹ Many of the original recommendations advanced by the Courts Working Group regarding collection and reporting of demographic information were incorporated into SB 56, the requirements of which are discussed on the following pages.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COURTS WORKING GROUP

I. DATA COLLECTION AND ACCESSIBILITY

CONCERNS:

California currently has 1,610 authorized judgeships², with one Supreme Court having seven justices, five appellate districts having 105 justices, and 58 Superior Courts with 1,498 judges. In seeking to establish baseline numbers reflective of the degree of diversity in the court system, working group members discovered that there were neither complete nor reliable statistics on the races, ethnicities and genders of the state's judges. The statistics provided by the Administrative Office of the Courts revealed that almost 500 judges, or approximately one-third of the state's judiciary, had declined to provide voluntary information on their race or ethnicity.

In order to establish baseline data on the degree of ethnic diversity among judges and justices, the members of the Courts Working Group compiled their own statistics for presentation at the summit. A copy of the statistical report on ethnic diversity is appended hereto as Attachment 3.

As was the case with obtaining official statistics on the level of ethnic diversity, it was similarly difficult to acquire official baseline data on the level of gender diversity in the courts. The Courts Working Group collected some preliminary numbers on the number of female and male judges, primarily by examining the names of judges, and presented those tentative figures at the Judicial Summit. A copy of the gender statistics is appended hereto as Attachment 4.

In addition to the 1,610 judges and justices, there are approximately 400 commissioners and referees who preside over cases in our courts. These subordinate judicial officers ("SJOs") are selected by the judges on whose courts they serve. The Courts Working Group again, finding no official statistics on the level of ethnic diversity among these SJOs, researched and compiled its own statistics, limited to diversity among commissioners. A copy of the statistical report reflecting the combined level of diversity among trial court judges and commissioners that was presented at the Judicial Summit is appended hereto as Attachment 5.

In addition to a paucity of information on the degree of diversity among sitting judges and commissioners, the Working Group encountered the absence of reliable information on the demographics of the current Governor's appointments to the bench. Appended hereto as Attachment 6 is the Courts Working Group's summary of judicial appointments for the period November 2003 to May 5, 2006, which was distributed to attendees at the judicial summit.

² Fifty (50) new trial court judgeships have already been approved by the Legislature. The Judicial Council anticipates that the legislature will approve and fund 100 more trial court judgeships over the next two years. These additional 150 seats will result in a total of 1,760 judgeships. In addition, the Judicial Council hopes to add an unspecified number of appellate judgeships. Thus, in the next five years, there may well be approximately 1,800 judges on the trial and appellate courts in California.

The absence of official baseline numbers will make it more difficult to assess the effectiveness of future efforts to diversify the judiciary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State Bar should assist the Governor's office and the Administrative Office of the Courts in the implementation of Senate Bill No. 56 (2005-2006 Reg. Sess., as amended August 29, 2006), now codified at Government Code section 12011.5(n), which requires the following:
 - (a) the Governor to disclose aggregate statewide demographic data provided by all judicial applicants relative to ethnicity and gender,
 - (b) the designated agency of the State Bar responsible for evaluation of judicial candidates to collect and release on an aggregate statewide basis (a) statewide demographic data relative to ethnicity and gender provided by judicial applicants reviewed by the designated State Bar agency, and (b) the statewide summary of the recommendations of the designated agency by ethnicity and gender, and
 - (c) the Administrative Office of the Courts to collect and release the demographic data provided by justices and judges relative to ethnicity and gender, by specific jurisdiction.
2. Working through the Bar Leaders Conference, the State Bar should encourage each county bar to provide an annual report to the State Bar regarding the state of diversity on that county's bench, using uniform reporting categories such as the racial and ethnic classifications used by the Department of Finance in its collection and reporting of demographic information. The State Bar should facilitate data collection by providing a standardized form. The report should be submitted by June 30 of each year, and should detail, as of December 31 of the preceding year, the aggregate race/ethnicity and gender of the judicial officers on that superior court bench. For those locales with no county bar association, the local bar association in an adjoining county should be encouraged and enlisted to gather the demographic data for that county.
3. The ethnic judges' associations (The Judicial Council of the California Association of Black Lawyers, The California Asian American Judges Association, the California Latino Judges Association, and the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association Judicial Council) should continue to work collaboratively to collect and release, on an aggregate statewide basis, demographic data on the diversity of California's state and federal courts. The racial and ethnic categories should correspond to those classifications used by the Department of Finance in its collection and reporting of demographic information. The groups should issue their first reports on June 30, 2007.

4. The Administrative Office of the Courts should be encouraged to collect and release aggregate data on the level of racial, ethnic, gender, and other recognized types of diversity among the commissioners and referees hired by the courts in the 58 counties.
5. The State Bar should seek to facilitate future discussions on pipeline “leakage” by maintaining statistics on the ethnic minority and women law school enrollment of all accredited California law schools and receiving input from minority and women law student associations (e.g., Law Students of African Descent, La Raza Law Students, Asian Law Students, etc.), minority bar associations, and its own advisory committees such as the Council on Access and Fairness.
6. The Governor’s Office, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the State Bar should establish a confidential mechanism for collecting and reporting voluntary information on the aggregate number of judges and SJOs who are lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgendered or who have a disability.

II. OVERCOMING BARRIERS:

CONCERNS:

The demographic data compiled by the working group revealed that in each of the 58 counties in California, the number of Caucasian judges on the bench exceeded the percentage of Caucasian population for the county. In many counties with high ethnic minority populations, and presumably high numbers of court users who were ethnic minorities, there were no judges of color presiding over the myriad matters adjudicated for that diverse population.

The members of the Working Group agreed that there were certain barriers—real and perceived—to achieving the goal of a truly diverse judiciary. The working group members acknowledge that the process of judicial appointments is an inherently political one, and that the job of appointing judges falls to the executive branch of government. Nonetheless, the working group felt that there were significant opportunities for all three branches of government to work together to improve the appointment process. The Judicial Branch --- its Judicial Council, judges and lawyers -- can help develop effective strategies to recruit, screen and retain a more diverse judiciary. The Legislative Branch’s system of checks and balances can be used to assure that efforts to achieve a more representative judiciary are realized. The Executive Branch can publicly declare a commitment to diversity in making appointments to the bench, just as it has declared a commitment to diversity in making appointments to boards and commissions.

The working group members felt that more transparency at certain critical junctures would increase public trust and confidence and advance the administration of justice.

One perceived barrier to achieving diversity relates to the judicial evaluation process. The various peer review processes required by statute (the Commission on Judicial

Nominees Evaluation (hereinafter “JNE”) or utilized by the Governor’s office for evaluating applicants for judicial appointments (county bar judicial evaluation committees) are perceived by some as being unfair to underrepresented groups due to a lack of transparency regarding the processes themselves, and a perceived lack of accountability for evaluative outcomes. Cultural and other biases may adversely affect the ratings given to minority applicants for judicial appointment by the JNE commissioners and the members of county bar judicial evaluation committees. While reliable statistical data is unavailable, there is a belief that a disproportionate percentage of ethnic minorities and women applicants are rated “not qualified” or barely “qualified” while non-ethnic minorities and male applicants with similar qualifications receive higher ratings.

Similarly, the screening committees used by the Governor’s office were also seen as barriers, to the extent that neither the names of these judicial gatekeepers, nor the criteria and process they employ to evaluate judicial applicants, are made public. The evaluations performed by these local screening committees often influence the Governor’s decisions as to which judicial candidates are forwarded for formal JNE evaluation. Thus arguably, these anonymous local screening committees, applying criteria and following a process unknown to the candidates or the public, can prevent qualified judicial candidates from advancing to the formal JNE screening process.

On a related note, the working group members recognized that many members of underrepresented groups have legal practices that emphasize civil, family, juvenile, probate, mediation, and other areas where jury trials are not common. The application for judicial appointment, and the JNE Commission evaluation form, both seem weighted heavily toward jury trial experience.

Finally, some interested parties raised concerns that, even though criminal jury trial experience seemed a preferred quality for applicants seeking appointment to the bench, those applicants who have extensive trial experience gained through representing criminal defendants (e.g., public defenders) were nonetheless perceived as “less qualified” to hold judicial office. Given the numbers of minorities and women engaged in criminal defense practice, this perception could further discourage minority and women applicants and limit the pool of diverse attorneys for appointment to the bench.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The State Bar should continue to conduct outreach to the minority and specialty bar associations to explain the role and procedures of the JNE Commission in the appointments process, to encourage members of minority and specialty bar associations to apply for positions on the JNE Commission, and to educate members of minority and specialty bar associations on the types of professional backgrounds, training, and experiences they should seek out to make them more attractive as judicial applicants.

2. The State Bar should require a minimum of two (2) hours of mandatory training for all JNE commissioners in the areas of fairness and bias in the judicial appointments process.
3. The State Bar should work with the Administrative Offices of the Courts and the Governor's office in implementing Senate Bill No. 56, as stated above.
4. County and state population figures³, not state bar membership, should be used as the standard in the reports under Senate Bill No. 56 by which the pool of desired level of diversity of judicial applicants should be measured.
5. County bar associations that have evaluation contracts with the Governor's office should be encouraged to submit an annual public report on the total number of applicants evaluated and the aggregate ratings given to applicants, relative to ethnicity and gender, modeled after the reports required of JNE by SB 56. These county bar association judicial evaluation committees should also be encouraged to disclose voluntarily the makeup of their membership in terms of racial, ethnic, gender and other recognized types of diversity.
6. The application form for judicial appointment used by the Governor's Office should be amended to add questions specifically designed to elicit an applicant's experience in areas of the law that may not involve jury trials or litigation and information about other qualifying experiences and skill-sets, including cultural sensitivity.
7. The JNE evaluation form should be amended to elicit evaluator comments on an applicant's experience in non-jury trials and about other qualifying experiences and skill-sets, including cultural sensitivity.
8. The Governor's Office is encouraged to articulate publicly its position on the importance of judicial diversity and its philosophy and strategies for achieving a more representative judiciary.
9. The leaders of the Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Branches should continue to work collaboratively to ensure that California's judiciary reflects the rich diversity of the population that it serves.

³The Working Group relies on Connerly v. State Personnel Board (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 16 for its view that the collection of accurate data based on race and gender does not violate Proposition 209. "[A] monitoring program designed to collect and report accurate and up-to-date information is justified by the compelling governmental need for such information. So long as such a program does not discriminate against or grant a preference to an individual or group, Proposition 209 is not implicated." (Id., 46-47.)

III. RECRUITMENT

CONCERNS:

Greater outreach and recruitment efforts are needed to increase the number of lawyers from diverse backgrounds who apply for judicial appointment. It is a necessary and proper role of the bar and the judiciary to develop long-range and viable recruitment strategies to achieve a larger applicant pool.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To the extent allowed by relevant provisions of the California Constitution (e.g. Proposition 209), the pool of commissioners and referees hired by each superior court should represent the rich diversity of the community served by that court.
2. In an effort to increase the applicant pool, judges should take a pro-active role in recruiting, grooming, and mentoring candidates from diverse backgrounds for judges, commissioners, referees, pro tem judges, and judicial clerks for the trial and appellate courts, helping them design individual strategies calculated to qualify them for eventual judicial appointment.
3. The State Bar should work with courts, in conjunction with local and specialty bar associations, to present educational programs for lawyers, patterned after the “So, You Want To Be A Judge?” programs presented by the California Women Lawyers bar association, to educate attendees on the judicial appointments and elections processes, judicial salary and benefits, and the overall benefits of pursuing a judicial career.
4. Because elections to judgeships can serve as a viable option for increasing diversity on the bench, judges should take a pro-active role in educating lawyers from diverse backgrounds on how to run for open judicial seats.
5. Judges should work with local, minority and other specialty bar associations to identify, recruit and support all qualified candidates for judicial appointment.
6. Mentor judges should provide support and preparation for all levels of the appointments process, in particular early career planning, “how to be a judge” programs, and mock interviews to prepare for meetings with local screening committees and the Governor’s Office.
7. Retiring ethnic minority judges should engage in “succession” planning by grooming ethnic minority lawyers to succeed to that seat.
8. Local, minority and other diversity bars should develop methods to identify and track the progress of ethnic minority and women judicial applicants.

IV. OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

CONCERNS:

Goal 1 of the Judicial Council's strategic plan, as amended in December 2006, provides:

California's courts will treat everyone in a fair and just manner. All persons will have equal access to the courts and court proceedings and programs. Court procedures will be fair and understandable to court users. Members of the judicial branch community will strive to understand and be responsive to the needs of court users from diverse cultural backgrounds. The makeup of California's judicial branch will reflect the diversity of the state's residents.

The Working Group recognizes that superior courts have ongoing community outreach programs that encourage judges to relate to their local communities. Despite tremendous and varied outreach efforts, however, many members of the public continue to experience an unacceptable level of dissatisfaction with their court experiences.

Public trust and confidence surveys also reveal that the perception still exists that certain ethnic minorities are treated unfairly in the court system. For example, in the most recent report published by the Judicial Council, more than half of all respondents, regardless of race or ethnicity, felt that African-Americans usually receive worse results with respect to case outcomes.⁴ Even more felt that individuals from low-income and non-English speaking communities experience worse case outcomes.

The attendees at the judicial summit and the members of the Working Group feel that the degree of diversity on the bench may impact the public's perception of the level of justice received by members of certain communities. Greater diversity may well lead to an increased level of public trust and confidence in the court system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The State Bar should work with the Judicial Council to implement an action plan to carry out Goal 1 of its strategic plan, with specific deadlines and timetables for achieving the goal of ensuring that the judicial branch reflects the diversity of the state's residents.
2. The State Bar and the Administrative Office of the Courts should implement similar education and outreach efforts to publicize career opportunities within

⁴ "It is notable and cause for substantial concern that the majority of every major ethnic group perceive "worse results" in outcomes for African-Americans, low-income people, and non-English speakers." 2005 *Trust and Confidence in the Courts, A Survey of the Public and Attorneys, Commissioned by the Administrative Office of the Courts and on behalf of the Judicial Council of California, September 2005, Part I: Findings and Recommendations, pages 29- 30.*

each organization and strive to ensure that staff members fairly represent the rich diversity of California's population. In addition, the Judicial Council should encourage justices of the Supreme Court and the Courts of Appeal to hire a diverse pool of law clerks and staff attorneys.

3. **OUTREACH TO THE COMMUNITY:** The State Bar and/or the Judicial Council, the Administrative Office of the Courts and its appropriate departments should:
 - a. develop strategies to educate the community at large on the importance of the judicial branch and the value of diversity on the bench career opportunities in the legal field. Courts should identify and present to diverse community groups judicial role models from non-traditional backgrounds.
 - b. consider developing and offering periodic regional workshops for judges and court leaders on appropriate community outreach, and should allow judges to count toward their minimum continuing education expectations any hours spent on such "qualified" outreach efforts.
 - c. encourage judges to work with community-based organizations (community groups, churches and other religious institutions, service clubs, etc.) in efforts to increase diversity in the courts.
4. **OUTREACH TO SCHOOLS:** The State Bar, and/or the Judicial Council, the Administrative Office of the Courts and its appropriate departments should:
 - a. work with school districts to develop age-appropriate "street law"- type programs for all grade levels (K-12) that expose students to the judicial process and the various roles for law enforcement, lawyers and judges in the juvenile and adult criminal justice systems.
 - b. be encouraged to develop, with the assistance of bar associations, educational programs for high school, college and law students on the judicial appointments and elections processes as a way to encourage youth to consider the judiciary as a career option.
 - c. be encouraged to fund local programs designed to create volunteer opportunities in the courts for high school, college and law students, and to expose them to job opportunities in various levels of court administration.
 - d. encourage courts to use the American Bar Association's mock trial programs or other similar programs for elementary school students (i.e., those based on familiar fairy tales) as a means of getting young people interested in legal careers.

- e. be encouraged to work with junior high and high school career counselors to encourage them to steer students from diverse backgrounds toward law as a viable career option.
 - f. prepare a readily accessible packet of materials for wide distribution to students providing information on the law as a career and the various roles lawyers can play in the judicial system, including becoming judges. The packet, which should be available online and through the mail, should also educate students on career options related to the judicial system, including such careers as court interpreters, police officers, probation officers, court reporters, clerks, bailiffs, etc.
5. OUTREACH TO LAW SCHOOLS: The State Bar, and/or the Judicial Council, the Administrative Office of the Courts and its appropriate departments should:
- a. be encouraged to work with college career planning counselors to develop and host pre-LSAT classes and “So, You Want To Be A Lawyer?” workshops.
 - b. be encouraged to work with local law schools to host an annual program for first year law students on how to lay the foundation for a future career as a judge.
 - c. work with local law schools to design county programs for law students, such as the Legal Aid clinics.
 - d. encourage and work with law schools to develop a week-long orientation course for entering students to help prepare them to succeed in law school.

CONCLUSIONS

The Courts Working Group believes that a diverse judiciary is not just an admirable goal, but also a necessary and achievable one. If the recommendations contained in this report are implemented, California’s judiciary will be on the path to reflecting the diversity of the population it is designed to serve. Increased diversity will result in a greater degree of public trust and confidence in the court system, and all California citizens will reap the positive benefits that flow from the perception that equal justice is indeed being dispensed in the state’s courthouses.

**State Bar of California
Courts Working Group
Diversity Pipeline Task Force
2005-2006**

BOARD OF GOVERNORS LIAISONS

Raymond G. Aragon
Vice President
P.O. Box 1713
Bonita, CA 91908
Phone: (619) 267-4743
Fax: (619) 267-4743
r-aragon@cox.net

Demetrius D. Shelton
Vice President
Office of the City Attorney
1 Frank Ogawa Plaza, 6th Floor
Oakland, Ca 94612
Phone: (510) 238-3493
Fax: (510) 238-2450
DDShelton@oaklandcityattorney.org

CHAIR

Hon. Brenda Harbin-Forte
Superior Court of California
Alameda County
24405 Amador Street
Hayward CA 95444
Phone: (510) 670-6380
Fax: (510) 670-5683
bharbin@alameda.courts.ca.gov

MEMBERS

Hon. Ronald M. George
Chief Justice
California Supreme Court
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, Ca 94102
Phone: (415) 865-7060
Fax: (415) 865-7181
ronald.george@jud.ca.gov
janet.ellenberg@jud.ca.gov
gale.tunnell@jud.ca.gov

Hon. Raul Ramirez (Ret.)
United States District Court
Eastern District of California
3900 American River Drive
Suite 145
Sacramento, CA 95864-5950
Phone: (916) 488-4050
Fax: (916) 488-3260
rrambond@aol.com

Hon. Martin J. Jenkins
United States District Court
Northern District of California
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 522-4708
Martin_Jenkins@cand.uscourts.gov
Debbie_Maghoney@cand.uscourts.gov

Hon. Maria P. Rivera
First District Court of Appeal
350 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 865-7240
Fax: (415) 865-7309
Maria.Rivera@jud.ca.gov

**State Bar of California
Courts Working Group
Diversity Pipeline Task Force
2005-2006**

Hon. Suzanne Bolanos
Superior Court of California
San Francisco County
400 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 551-3709
SBolanos@sftc.org

Hon. Cynthia Loo
Superior Court of California
Los Angeles County
Eastlake Juvenile Court
1601 Eastlake Blvd., Dept. 205
Los Angeles, CA 90033
Phone: (323) 226-2891
clloo@LASuperiorCourt.org

Hon. Patricia Cowett
Superior Court of California
San Diego County
P.O. Box 122724
San Diego, CA 92112
Phone: (619) 685-6039
patricia.cowett@sdcourt.ca.gov

Hon. John Pacheco
Superior Court of California
San Bernardino County
351 North Arrowhead, Dept. 11
San Bernardino, CA 92415
Phone: (909) 387-3072
jpacheco@courts.sbcounty.gov

Hon. James Herman
Superior Court of California
Santa Barbara County
312 East Cook Street
Santa Maria, CA 93454
Phone: (805) 346-7590
jherman@sbcourts.org

Hon. Patricia J. Titus
Superior Court of California
Los Angeles County
Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street, Dept 34
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-6045
Fax: (213) 680-9932
PTitus@LASuperiorCourt.org

Hon. Esteban Hernandez
Superior Court of California
San Diego County
South County Division, Dept. 14
500 Third Avenue
Chula Vista, CA 91910
Phone: (619) 691-4411
Fax: (619) 691-4584
esteban.Hernandez@sdcourt.ca.gov

Hon. Diana Becton Smith
Superior Court of California
Contra Costa County
725 Court Street
Martinez, CA 94553
Phone: (925) 646-9330
DBECT@contracosta.courts.ca.gov

Hon. Russell L. Hom
Superior Court of California
Sacramento County
Gordon Schaber Courthouse
720 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-5237
homr@saccourt.co

Hon. Emily E. Vasquez
Superior Court of California
Sacramento County
720 Ninth Street, Dept. 62
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 874-6893
Emily.Vasquez@saccourt.com
VasqueE@saccourt.com

**State Bar of California
Courts Working Group
Diversity Pipeline Task Force
2005-2006**

Hon. Fumiko Wasserman
Superior Court of California
Los Angeles County
111 North Hill Street, Dept. 70
Los Angeles, CA 90012
Phone: (213) 974-5791
Fax: (213) 617-7176
fwasserm@lasuperiorcourt.org

Hon. Erica Yew
Superior Court of California
Santa Clara County
191 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95113
Phone: (408) 882-2110
EYew@scscourt.org

Hon. LaDoris H. Cordell (Ret.)
Special Counselor to the
President for Campus Relations
Stanford University
Building 170, First Floor
Stanford, CA 94305-2040
Phone: (650) 725-8395
Fax: (650) 725-3577
lcordell@stanford.edu

Hon. Cruz Reynoso (Ret.)
UC Davis School of Law
400 Mrak Hall Drive
Davis, CA 95616
Phone: (530) 752-2897
Fax: (530) 752-4704
creynoso@ucdavis.edu

Donna Clay-Conti
Senior Attorney
Office of the General Counsel
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the
Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 865-7911
Fax: (415) 865-7664
Donna.Clay-Conti@jud.ca.gov

Michael Roosevelt
California Judicial Education and
Research (CJER)
Judicial Council of California
Administrative Office of the
Courts
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
Phone: (415) 865-7820
Fax: (415) 865-4338
Michael.Roosevelt@jud.ca.gov

**CONTINUING A LEGACY OF EXCELLENCE:
A SUMMIT ON DIVERSITY IN THE JUDICIARY
Saturday, June 3, 2006, San Jose Marriott Hotel
301 South Market Street, San Jose, California
(408) 280-1300**

PROGRAM

9:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Registration

11:00 a.m.- 1:00 pm

Buffet luncheon

12:00 - 12:30 p.m. Welcome and Opening Remarks

Hon. Brenda F. Harbin-Forte, Alameda County Superior Court, Chair, Courts and Government/
Public Sector Working Group, State Bar's Diversity Pipeline Task Force
James Heiting, Esq., President, State Bar of California
Hon. James Lambden, Court of Appeal, First District, Chair, Judicial Council's Access &
Fairness Advisory Committee
Hon. Ronald M. George, Chief Justice, California Supreme Court

12:30-1:45 p.m. Panel One: Identifying The Barriers

Panelists discuss why a diverse judiciary serves the public interest and improves public trust and confidence, and take a candid look at the various barriers to establishing a more diverse judiciary

Hon. LaDoris Cordell (Ret.) Santa Clara County Superior Court, Moderator
Hon. William J. Murray, San Joaquin County Superior Court
Hon. Emily Vasquez, Sacramento County Superior Court
Hon. Erica Yew, Santa Clara County Superior Court
John Davies, Esq., Judicial Appointments Advisor, Office of the Governor
Andrew Sweet, Esq., Chair, State Bar's Commission on Judicial Nominees Evaluation
Chris Arriola, Esq., President, Santa Clara County Bar Association

1:45- 2:00 p.m. BREAK

2:00- 3:30 p.m. Concurrent Discussion Groups: Finding The Solutions

Participants engage in small group discussions to explore ways to overcome identified barriers to creating a diverse judiciary, and report back their recommendations to the full group

3:30- 4:45 p.m. Panel Two: A Call To Action: Reality Checks And Recommendations

Panelists comment on proposed recommendations, discuss strategies that have proven successful in the past, and propose methods for improving greater access to justice through achieving and maintaining a diverse judiciary

Hon. Laurie Zelon, Court of Appeal, Second District, Moderator
Hon. Candace Cooper, Presiding Justice, Court of Appeal, Second District (*invited*)
Hon. George Hernandez, Alameda County Superior Court
Hon. Russ Hom, Sacramento County Superior Court
Hon. Burt Pines, Los Angeles Superior Court
Demetrius Shelton, Esq., Oakland City Attorney's Office, and Vice President, State Bar
Mr. Bill Vickrey, Administrative Director of the Courts

4:45 to 5:00 p.m. CLOSING REMARKS

Hon. Brenda F. Harbin-Forte

5:00 p.m. ADJOURN

ETHNIC-GENDER DIVERSITY IN THE CALIFORNIA COURTS
AS OF MAY 5, 2006

COURT	AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN	AFRICAN AMERICAN MEN	ASIAN P/I WOMEN	ASIAN P/I MEN	LATINA WOMEN	LATINO MEN	TOTAL ETHNIC	TOTAL # OF SEATS	%AGE ETHNIC
Supreme Court	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	7	42.8%
Courts of Appeal	2	1	2	1	2	2	10 *	105	9.5% *
Superior Courts	34	50	25	47	23	84	263 *	1498	17.5% *
Totals	36	51	28	49	25	87	276 *	1610	17.1% *

* Sources: According to the Governor's Office, 6 African-Americans, 11 Asian Americans, and 10 Latinos have been appointed, for a total of 27 ethnic minority appointments. However, the Governor's Office has not identified the courts to which the appointments have been made. The totals contained in this chart are based on California Courts: Locations, Justices and Judges (May 2006 ed.; a publication of the Administrative Office of the Courts), as well as current membership rosters of and surveys conducted by the Judicial Council of the California Association of Black Lawyers, the California Asian American Judges Association, the California Latino Judges Association, and the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association Judicial Council

APPELLATE COURTS --ETHNIC MINORITY JUSTICES
AS OF MAY 5, 2006 *

COURT	TOTAL ETHNIC JUSTICES	TOTAL JUDGESHIIPS/ % ETHNIC		AFRICAN- AMERICANS	ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDERS	LATINOS
SUPREME COURT	3	7	42.8%	0	2	1
FIRST APPELLATE DIST. ¹	1	20	5.0%	0	0	1
SECOND APPELLATE DIST. ²	5	32	15.6%	2	2	1
THIRD APPELLATE DIST. ³	2	11	18.2%	1	1	0
FOURTH APPELLATE DIST. ⁴	2	25	8.0%	0	0	2
FIFTH APPELLATE DIST. ⁵	0	10	0%	0	0	0
SIXTH APPELLATE DIST. ⁶	1	7	14.3%	0	1	0
TOTALS	14 *	112	12.5%	3	6	5

* **Sources:** According to the Governor's Office, 6 African Americans, 11 Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 10 Latinos have been appointed, for a total of 27 ethnic minority appointments. However, the Governor's Office has not identified the courts to which appointments have been made. The totals contained in this chart are based on California Courts: Locations, Justices and Judges (May 2006 ed.; a publication of the Administrative Office of the Courts), as well as current membership rosters of and surveys conducted by the Judicial Council of the California Association of Black Lawyers, the California Asian American Judges Association, the California Latino Judges Association, and the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association Judicial Council

¹ The First District is comprised of the following 12 counties: Alameda; Contra Costa; Del Norte; Humboldt; Lake; Marin; Mendocino; Napa; San Francisco; San Mateo; Solano; and Sonoma

² The Second District is comprised of the following 4 counties: Los Angeles; San Luis Obispo; Santa Barbara; and Ventura

³ The Third District is comprised of the following 23 counties: Alpine; Amador; Butte; Calaveras; Colusa; El Dorado; Glenn; Lassen; Modoc; Mono; Nevada; Placer; Plumas; Sacramento; San Joaquin; Shasta; Sierra; Siskiyou; Sutter; Tehama; Trinity; Yolo; and Yuba

⁴ The Fourth District is comprised of the following 6 counties: Imperial; Inyo; Orange; Riverside; San Bernardino; and San Diego

⁵ The Fifth District is comprised of the following 9 counties: Fresno; Kern; Kings; Madera; Mariposa; Merced; Stanislaus; Tulare; and Tuolumne

⁶ The Sixth District is comprised of the following 4 counties: Monterey; San Benito; Santa Clara; and Santa Cruz

GENDER DIVERSITY- SUPERIOR COURTS- AS OF MAY 2006- PRELIMINARY

COUNTY	JUDGES			TOTAL AUTH'D JUDGES	VACANCIES	COMMISSIONERS			TOTAL AUTH'D COMM'R'S	VACANCIES
	M	F	Filled			M	F	Filled		
Alameda	48	18	66	69	3	11	5	16	16	0
Alpine	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Amador	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Butte	8	2	10	10	0	2	0	2	2	0
Calaveras	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Colusa	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Contra Costa	18	15	33	33	0	10	2	12	14	2
Del Norte	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
El Dorado	5	1	6	6	0	2	0	2	2	0
Fresno	32	4	36	36	0	4	4	8	9	1
Glenn	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
Humboldt	6	1	7	7	0	0	1	1	1	0
Imperial	7	1	8	9	1	2	0	2	2	0
Inyo	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
Kern	30	3	33	33	0	5	1	6	7	1
Kings	6	1	7	7	0	1	1	2	2	0
Lake	4	0	4	4	0	1	0	1	1	0
Lassen	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
Los Angeles	300	126	426	429	3	96	36	132	135	3
Madera	6	1	7	7	0	0	1	1	2	1
Marin	7	3	10	10	0	3	1	4	5	1
Mariposa	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Mendocino	7	1	8	8	0	1	0	1	2	1
Merced	6	0	6	6	0	4	0	4	4	0
Modoc	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mono	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
Monterey	13	5	18	18	0	1	1	2	2	0
Napa	4	2	6	6	0	1	0	1	2	1
Nevada	5	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	1
Orange	82	27	109	109	0	30	3	33	35	2
Placer	7	2	9	9	0	2	2	4	4	0

GENDER DIVERSITY- SUPERIOR COURTS- AS OF MAY 2006- PRELIMINARY

COUNTY	JUDGES			TOTAL AUTH'D JUDGES	VACANCIES	COMMISSIONERS			TOTAL AUTH'D COMM'R'S	VACANCIES
	M	F	Filled			M	F	Filled		
Plumas	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0
Riverside	40	9	49	49	0	15	5	20	20	0
Sacramento	38	13	51	52	1	3	3	6	8	2
San Benito	2	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	1
San Bernardino	46	14	60	63	3	10	2	12	12	0
San Diego	90	36	126	128	2	15	7	22	22	0
San Francisco	28	22	50	50	0	6	8	14	14	0
San Joaquin	18	8	26	26	0	3	1	4	4	0
San Luis Obispo	7	3	10	11	1	3	0	3	4	1
San Mateo	18	8	26	26	0	3	4	7	7	0
Santa Barbara	16	2	18	19	1	3	2	5	5	0
Santa Clara	58	21	79	79	0	4	5	9	10	1
Santa Cruz	7	1	8	10	2	2	1	3	3	0
Shasta	8	1	9	9	0	2	0	2	2	0
Sierra	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Siskiyou	3	1	4	4	0	0	1	1	1	0
Solano	13	2	15	16	1	2	3	5	6	1
Sonoma	13	3	16	16	0	2	4	6	6	0
Stanislaus	12	5	17	17	0	2	2	4	4	0
Sutter	5	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	1	1
Tehama	4	0	4	4	0	1	0	1	1	0
Trinity	2	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0
Tulare	13	3	16	16	0	3	1	4	4	0
Tuolumne	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	1
Ventura	23	5	28	28	0	4	0	4	4	0
Yolo	6	3	9	9	0	2	1	3	3	0
Yuba	2	3	5	5	0	1	0	1	1	0
TOTALS	1,101	379	1,480	1,498	18	269	109	378	406	29

Percentages 74.4% 25.6% 100.0%

71.2% 28.8% 100.0%

GENDER DIVERSITY -- APPELLATE COURTS
AS OF MAY 5, 2006 *

COURT	TOTAL WOMEN JUSTICES	TOTAL JUDGESHIPS	% WOMEN
CALIFORNIA SUPREME COURT	3	7	42.8%
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT ¹	6	20	30.0%
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT ²	11	32	34.4%
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT ³	2	11	18.2%
FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT ⁴	8	25	32.0%
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT ⁵	2	10	20%
SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT ⁶	2	7	28.6%
TOTALS	34	112	30.3%

* **Sources:** California Courts: Locations, Justices and Judges (May 2006 ed.; a publication of the Administrative Office of the Courts); public records regarding judicial appointments.

¹ The First District is comprised of the following 12 counties: Alameda; Contra Costa; Del Norte; Humboldt; Lake; Marin; Mendocino; Napa; San Francisco; San Mateo; Solano; and Sonoma

² The Second District is comprised of the following 4 counties: Los Angeles; San Luis Obispo; Santa Barbara; and Ventura

³ The Third District is comprised of the following 23 counties: Alpine; Amador; Butte; Calaveras; Colusa; El Dorado; Glenn; Lassen; Modoc; Mono; Nevada; Placer; Plumas; Sacramento; San Joaquin; Shasta; Sierra; Siskiyou; Sutter; Tehama; Trinity; Yolo; and Yuba

⁴ The Fourth District is comprised of the following 6 counties: Imperial; Inyo; Orange; Riverside; San Bernardino; and San Diego

⁵ The Fifth District is comprised of the following 9 counties: Fresno; Kern; Kings; Madera; Mariposa; Merced; Stanislaus; Tulare; and Tuolumne

⁶ The Sixth District is comprised of the following 4 counties: Monterey; San Benito; Santa Clara; and Santa Cruz

ETHNIC MINORITY COMMISSIONERS AND JUDGES VS. % OF POPULATION

COUNTY	% White of Total Population	% 3 Ethnic Groups of Total Pop*	% 3 Ethnic of All Bench Officers	AFRICAN-AMERICAN				ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER				LATINO / HISPANIC				TOTAL ETHNIC BENCH OFFICERS**			TOTAL AUTH'D BENCH OFFICERS		
				J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J	C	Tot	J	C	Total
Alameda	39.1%	57.7%	32.9%	14(4)	18	21.2%	13.1%	4(0)	4	4.7%	23.2%	6(0)	6	7.1%	21.4%	24	4	28	69	16	85
Alpine	71.7%	9.3%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.7%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Amador	82.4%	14.5%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	9.7%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Butte	79.2%	16.7%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	12.1%	0	0	0	10	2	12
Calaveras	85.9%	10.0%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	8.4%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Colusa	46.8%	50.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	48.2%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Contra Costa	55.8%	41.7%	10.6%	1(1)	2	4.3%	8.7%	2(0)	2	4.3%	12.3%	1(0)	1	2.1%	20.7%	4	1	5	33	14	47
Del Norte	69.2%	21.6%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	14.8%	0	0	0	2	1	3
El Dorado	85.3%	12.2%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	9.8%	0	0	0	6	2	8
Fresno	37.2%	60.8%	22.2%	3(0)	3	6.7%	4.9%	1(0)	1	2.2%	9.0%	5(1)	6	13.3%	46.9%	9	1	10	36	9	45
Glenn	62.0%	34.7%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	30.9%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Humboldt	81.7%	9.6%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.0%	0	0	0	7	1	8
Imperial	19.4%	79.2%	27.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.1%	3(0)	3	27.3%	73.8%	3	0	3	9	2	11
Inyo	76.6%	13.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	12.4%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Kern	46.7%	51.1%	10.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.7%	1(3)	4	10.0%	41.8%	1	3	4	33	7	40
Kings	41.4%	54.4%	22.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	8.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.9%	2(0)	2	22.2%	45.5%	2	0	2	7	2	9
Lake	79.8%	16.8%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	13.0%	0	0	0	4	1	5
Lassen	73.5%	22.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	13.6%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Los Angeles	30.0%	68.0%	24.1%	38(10)	48	8.5%	8.7%	35(4)	39	6.9%	13.0%	43(6)	49	8.7%	46.3%	116	20	136	429	135	564
Madera	46.7%	50.2%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	45.9%	0	0	0	7	2	9
Marin	76.4%	21.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	14.1%	0	0	0	10	5	15
Mariposa	86.2%	8.5%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.1%	0	0	0	2	2	4
Mendocino	72.2%	19.8%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	17.9%	0	0	0	8	2	10
Merced	37.0%	61.0%	10.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.9%	1(0)	1	10.0%	6.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	51.9%	1	0	1	6	4	10
Modoc	84.7%	10.5%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	9.4%	0	0	0	2	0	2
Mono	72.8%	23.6%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	22.0%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Monterey	36.1%	61.6%	20.0%	1(0)	1	5.0%	2.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	6.4%	3(0)	3	15.0%	52.4%	4	0	4	18	2	20
Napa	64.4%	33.2%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	27.7%	0	0	0	6	2	8
Nevada	90.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.7%	0	0	0	6	1	7
Orange	47.9%	49.8%	12.5%	3(0)	3	2.1%	1.3%	6(0)	6	4.2%	15.6%	8(1)	9	6.3%	33.0%	17	1	18	109	35	144

J= Judge C= Commissioner * Excludes "American Indian" and "Multirace" categories.

Sources: Dept of Finance, March 2006 report; surveys and membership rosters of various ethnic judges association.

ETHNIC MINORITY COMMISSIONERS AND JUDGES VS. % OF POPULATION

	% White of Total Population	% 3 Ethnic Groups of Total Pop*	% 3 Ethnic of All Bench Officers	AFRICAN-AMERICAN				ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER				LATINO / HISPANIC				TOTAL ETHNIC BENCH OFFICERS			TOTAL AUTH'D BENCH OFFICERS		
				J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J(C)	Tot	% All	% Pop	J	C	Tot	J	C	Total
Placer	81.0%	16.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	11.5%	0	0	0	9	4	13
Plumas	90.0%	6.2%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.1%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Riverside	46.4%	51.1%	5.8%	1(0)	1	1.4%	5.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.4%	1(2)	3	4.3%	40.4%	2	2	4	49	20	69
Sacramento	53.9%	41.3%	23.3%	5(0)	5	8.3%	9.5%	4(1)	5	8.3%	12.8%	4(1)	5	8.3%	19.0%	13	1	14	52	8	60
San Benito	42.6%	55.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	51.8%	0	0	0	2	1	3
San Bernardino	38.9%	59.1%	6.7%	1(0)	1	1.3%	8.9%	2(0)	2	2.7%	5.4%	2(0)	2	2.7%	44.9%	5	0	5	63	12	75
San Diego	54.7%	42.3%	12.7%	6(0)	6	75.0%	5.0%	5(0)	5	3.3%	9.7%	7(1)	8	5.3%	27.5%	18	1	19	128	22	150
San Francisco	44.7%	52.4%	21.9%	4(2)	6	9.4%	7.1%	5(1)	6	9.4%	31.7%	2(0)	2	3.1%	13.5%	11	3	14	50	14	64
San Joaquin	43.6%	53.4%	13.3%	2(0)	2	6.7%	6.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	13.5%	2(0)	2	6.7%	33.1%	4	0	4	26	4	30
San Luis Obispo	74.2%	23.4%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	18.7%	0	0	0	11	4	15
San Mateo	46.6%	50.8%	6.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.5%	1(0)	1	3.0%	23.6%	1(0)	1	3.0%	23.7%	2	0	2	26	7	33
Santa Barbara	56.4%	41.5%	16.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.2%	3(1)	4	16.7%	34.9%	3	1	4	19	5	24
Santa Clara	43.0%	54.5%	16.9%	2(0)	2	2.2%	2.7%	3(1)	4	4.5%	27.0%	8 (1)	9	10.1%	24.8%	13	2	15	79	10	89
Santa Cruz	61.3%	36.3%	7.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	4.3%	1(0)	1	7.7%	31.1%	1	0	1	10	3	13
Shasta	86.6%	8.7%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.7%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.5%	0	0	0	9	2	11
Sierra	91.1%	5.8%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.4%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Siskiyou	82.8%	10.3%	20.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.2%	1(0)	1	20.0%	1.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.9%	1	0	1	4	1	5
Solano	47.3%	48.5%	13.6%	2(0)	2	9.1%	13.2%	0(1)	1	4.5%	15.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	20.4%	2	1	3	16	6	22
Sonoma	71.0%	26.0%	9.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.4%	1(0)	1	4.5%	4.1%	0(1)	1	4.5%	20.5%	1	1	2	16	6	22
Stanislaus	52.1%	45.2%	4.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	5.0%	1(0)	1	4.8%	37.8%	1	0	1	17	4	21
Sutter	56.3%	40.7%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.6%	0(0)	0	0.0%	12.3%	0(0)	0	0.0%	26.7%	0	0	0	5	1	6
Tehama	76.8%	19.1%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	17.8%	0	0	0	4	1	5
Trinity	87.9%	4.5%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.4%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.6%	0	0	0	2	1	3
Tulare	39.4%	58.6%	15.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.2%	0(0)	0	0.0%	3.3%	1(2)	3	15.0%	54.1%	1	2	3	16	4	20
Tuolumne	85.1%	11.5%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	1.9%	0(0)	0	0.0%	0.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	8.8%	0	0	0	4	1	5
Ventura	53.0%	45.0%	9.4%	1(0)	1	3.1%	1.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.0%	2(0)	2	6.3%	36.4%	3	0	3	28	4	32
Yolo	55.9%	40.8%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	10.5%	0(0)	0	0.0%	28.2%	0	0	0	9	3	12
Yuba	63.8%	30.7%	0.0%	0(0)	0	0.0%	2.8%	0(0)	0	0.0%	7.1%	0(0)	0	0.0%	20.8%	0	0	0	5	1	6
TOTALS	44.6%	52.8%	16.1%	84(17)	101	5.3%	6.0%	71(8)	79	4.1%	12.0%	107(19)	126	6.6%	34.8%	262	44	306	1,498	407	1,905

J= Judge C= Commissioner * Excludes "American Indian" and "Multirace" categories.

Sources: Dept of Finance, March 2006 report; surveys and membership rosters of various ethnic judges association.

SUPERIOR COURT DIVERSITY AS OF MAY 5, 2006 - % OF POPULATION VS. % OF JUDGES

COUNTY	% White of Total Population	%3 Ethnic Groups of Total Pop*	% 3 Ethnic Judges of Total Judges	AFRICAN-AMERICAN			ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER			LATINO/HISPANIC			TOTAL ETHNIC JUDGES	TOTAL JUDGES
				Jdgs	% Jdgs	% Pop	Jdgs	%Jdgs	% Pop	Jdgs	% Jdgs	% Pop		
Alameda	39.1%	57.7%	34.8%	14	20.3%	13.1%	4	5.8%	23.2%	6	8.7%	21.4%	24	69
Alpine	71.7%	9.3%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	1.1%	0	0.0%	7.7%	0	2
Amador	82.4%	14.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.8%	0	0.0%	1.0%	0	0.0%	9.7%	0	2
Butte	79.2%	16.7%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.3%	0	0.0%	3.3%	0	0.0%	12.1%	0	10
Calaveras	85.9%	10.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.7%	0	0.0%	0.9%	0	0.0%	8.4%	0	2
Colusa	46.8%	50.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	1.7%	0	0.0%	48.2%	0	2
Contra Costa	55.8%	41.7%	12.1%	1	3.0%	8.7%	2	6.1%	12.3%	1	3.0%	20.7%	4	33
Del Norte	69.2%	21.6%	0.0%	0	0.0%	4.4%	0	0.0%	2.4%	0	0.0%	14.8%	0	2
El Dorado	85.3%	12.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.4%	0	0.0%	2.0%	0	0.0%	9.8%	0	6
Fresno	37.2%	60.8%	25.0%	3	8.3%	4.9%	1	2.8%	9.0%	5	13.9%	46.9%	9	36
Glenn	62.0%	34.7%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.4%	0	0.0%	3.4%	0	0.0%	30.9%	0	2
Humboldt	81.7%	9.6%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	1.8%	0	0.0%	7.0%	0	7
Imperial	19.4%	79.2%	33.3%	0	0.0%	3.3%	0	0.0%	2.1%	3	33.3%	73.8%	3	9
Inyo	76.6%	13.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.1%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	12.4%	0	2
Kern	46.7%	51.1%	3.0%	0	0.0%	5.6%	0	0.0%	3.7%	1	3.0%	41.8%	1	33
Kings	41.4%	54.4%	28.6%	0	0.0%	8.0%	0	0.0%	0.9%	2	28.6%	45.5%	2	7
Lake	79.8%	16.8%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.9%	0	0.0%	1.9%	0	0.0%	13.0%	0	4
Lassen	73.5%	22.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	7.9%	0	0.0%	1.0%	0	0.0%	13.6%	0	2
Los Angeles	30.0%	68.0%	27.0%	38	8.9%	8.7%	35	8.2%	13.0%	43	10.0%	46.3%	116	429
Madera	46.7%	50.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.0%	0	0.0%	1.3%	0	0.0%	45.9%	0	7
Marin	76.4%	21.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.9%	0	0.0%	4.4%	0	0.0%	14.1%	0	10
Mariposa	86.2%	8.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	7.1%	0	2
Mendocino	72.2%	19.8%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	1.3%	0	0.0%	17.9%	0	8
Merced	37.0%	61.0%	16.7%	0	0.0%	2.9%	1	16.7%	6.2%	0	0.0%	51.9%	1	6
Modoc	84.7%	10.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.0%	9.4%	0	2
Mono	72.8%	23.6%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	1.2%	0	0.0%	22.0%	0	2
Monterey	36.1%	61.6%	22.2%	1	5.6%	2.8%	0	0.0%	6.4%	3	16.7%	52.4%	4	18
Napa	64.4%	33.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.2%	0	0.0%	4.3%	0	0.0%	27.7%	0	6
Nevada	90.8%	6.8%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	5.7%	0	6
Orange	47.9%	49.8%	15.6%	3	2.8%	1.3%	6	5.5%	15.6%	8	7.3%	33.0%	17	109
Placer	81.0%	16.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.0%	4.3%	0	0.0%	11.5%	0	9
Plumas	90.0%	6.2%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.0%	0.6%	0	0.0%	5.1%	0	2
Riverside	46.4%	51.1%	4.1%	1	2.0%	5.4%	0	0.0%	5.4%	1	2.0%	40.4%	2	49
Sacramento	53.9%	41.3%	25.0%	5	9.6%	9.5%	4	7.7%	12.8%	4	7.7%	19.0%	13	52
San Benito	42.6%	55.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.0%	0	0.0%	2.6%	0	0.0%	51.8%	0	2
San Bernardino	38.9%	59.1%	7.9%	1	1.6%	8.9%	2	3.2%	5.4%	2	3.2%	44.9%	5	63

* Excludes "American Indian" and "Multirace." Sources: CA Dept of Finance March 2006 report; surveys and membership rosters of various ethnic judges associations.

Judge. B.H-F (5/29/06) 1

SUPERIOR COURT DIVERSITY AS OF MAY 5, 2006 - % OF POPULATION VS. % OF JUDGES

COUNTY	% White of Total Population	%3 Ethnic Groups of Total Pop*	% 3 Ethnic Judges of Total Judges	AFRICAN-AMERICAN			ASIAN/PACIFIC ISLANDER			LATINO/HISPANIC			TOTAL ETHNIC JUDGES	TOTAL JUDGES
				Jdgs	% Jdgs	% Pop	Jdgs	% Jdgs	% Pop	Jdgs	% Jdgs	% Pop.		
San Diego	54.7%	42.3%	14.1%	6	4.7%	5.0%	5	3.9%	9.7%	7	5.5%	27.5%	18	128
San Francisco	44.7%	52.4%	22.0%	4	8.0%	7.1%	5	10.0%	31.7%	2	4.0%	13.5%	11	50
San Joaquin	43.6%	53.4%	15.4%	2	7.7%	6.7%	0	0.0%	13.5%	2	7.7%	33.1%	4	26
San Luis Obispo	74.2%	23.4%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.8%	0	0.0%	2.8%	0	0.0%	18.7%	0	11
San Mateo	46.6%	50.8%	7.7%	0	0.0%	3.5%	1	3.8%	23.6%	1	3.8%	23.7%	2	26
Santa Barbara	56.4%	41.5%	15.8%	0	0.0%	2.4%	0	0.0%	4.2%	3	15.8%	34.9%	3	19
Santa Clara	43.0%	54.5%	16.5%	2	2.5%	2.7%	3	3.8%	27.0%	8	10.1%	24.8%	13	79
Santa Cruz	61.3%	36.3%	10.0%	0	0.0%	0.9%	0	0.0%	4.3%	1	10.0%	31.1%	1	10
Shasta	86.6%	8.7%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.7%	0	0.0%	2.5%	0	0.0%	5.5%	0	9
Sierra	91.1%	5.8%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.0%	0.2%	0	0.0%	5.4%	0	2
Siskiyou	82.8%	10.3%	25.0%	0	0.0%	1.2%	1	25.0%	1.2%	0	0.0%	7.9%	1	4
Solano	47.3%	48.5%	12.5%	2	12.5%	13.2%	0	0.0%	15.0%	0	0.0%	20.4%	2	16
Sonoma	71.0%	26.0%	6.3%	0	0.0%	1.4%	1	6.3%	4.1%	0	0.0%	20.5%	1	16
Stanislaus	52.1%	45.2%	5.9%	0	0.0%	2.4%	0	0.0%	5.0%	1	5.9%	37.8%	1	17
Sutter	56.3%	40.7%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.6%	0	0.0%	12.3%	0	0.0%	26.7%	0	5
Tehama	76.8%	19.1%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	17.8%	0	4
Trinity	87.9%	4.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.4%	0	0.0%	0.5%	0	0.0%	3.6%	0	2
Tulare	39.4%	58.6%	6.3%	0	0.0%	1.2%	0	0.0%	3.3%	1	6.3%	54.1%	1	16
Tuolumne	85.1%	11.5%	0.0%	0	0.0%	1.9%	0	0.0%	0.8%	0	0.0%	8.8%	0	4
Ventura	53.0%	45.0%	10.7%	1	3.6%	1.5%	0	0.0%	7.0%	2	7.1%	36.4%	3	28
Yolo	55.9%	40.8%	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.1%	0	0.0%	10.5%	0	0.0%	28.2%	0	9
Yuba	63.8%	30.7%	0.0%	0	0.0%	2.8%	0	0.0%	7.1%	0	0.0%	20.8%	0	5
STATE TOTALS	44.6%	52.8%	17.5%	84	5.6%	6.0%	71	11.0%	12.0%	107	7.1%	34.8%	262	1,498

Sources: CA Dept. of Finance; surveys and membership rosters of various ethnic judges associations.

Updated 5/29/06. Judge B. Harbin-Forte

GOVERNOR'S ETHNIC MINORITY JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS
THROUGH MAY 5, 2006 *

COURT	AFRICAN-AMERICAN WOMEN	AFRICAN AMERICAN MEN	ASIAN P/I WOMEN	ASIAN P/I MEN	LATINA WOMEN	LATINO MEN	TOTAL ETHNIC	TOTAL # OF APPTS	%AGE ETHNIC
Supreme Court	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0%
Courts of Appeal	0	0	1	1	1	0	3 *	14	21.4% *
Superior Courts	2	4	2	5	2	6	21 *	140	15.0% *
Totals	2	4	3	6	3	6	24 *	155	15.5% *

NOTE: GOVERNOR'S TERM BEGAN IN NOVEMBER 2003

* Sources: According to the Governor's Office, 6 African-Americans, 11 Asian Americans, and 10 Latinos have been appointed, for a total of 27 ethnic minority appointments. However, the Governor's Office has not identified the courts to which the appointments have been made. The totals contained in this chart are based on California Courts: Locations, Justices and Judges (May 2006 ed.; a publication of the Administrative Office of the Courts), as well as current membership rosters of and surveys conducted by the Judicial Council of the California Association of Black Lawyers, the California Asian American Judges Association, the California Latino Judges Association, and the National Asian Pacific American Bar Association Judicial Council